Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/827,023	BLAZAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Q. JANICE LI	1633
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Q. JANICE LI, PTO</u> .	(3)	
(2) Quang D. Nguyen, Appl. Rep.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 September 2009	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: 1, 5, 11, 28		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa	he examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Q. JANICE LI/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/827,023

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

With respect to claim 1, a), inserting "irradiated" before "CD4+" to distinquish the invention from the prior art; b), inserting "culture-expanded" before "therapeutic" to provide antecedent basis for "said culture expanded Treg cells"; c), deleting the phrase "with enhanced suppressor activity" to overcome 112, 2nd paragraph issue, the argument for 112, 1st paragraph was persuasive.

Claims 5, 11, 28 need further clarification. The applicant's representative agreed to cancel claim 28, and to amend claims 1, 5, 11 as proposed by an examiner's amendment..